

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: List Admin/Owner BoatAnchor Mail List <listown@jackatak.theporch.com>  
Subject: Administrivia: System Outage  
Message-ID: <9512072224.aa26399@jackatak.theporch.com>

Gang-

The fibre seems to have made the post...

\*SATURDAY\* 9 December 1995 is the day, and our ISP will be lights out from 13:00 UTC until 05:00 UTC 10 December 1995 (that's 8AM to midnight Central time for the Universal Time Coordinated Challenged out there ;^)

So, we get a new fibre Net link and the ISP gains capacity, and I may just try to install a new version of Unix on this dog! ;^) Or fix the repeater... or help with the VE session... or...

You get the idea, do something \*else\* on Saturday, and do \*NOT\* ping the list or send dupes just because it doesn't show up immediately! And take it easy once we come back up... we may try some "fixes" and they may not all work!

--

73

Jack, W4PPT/Mobile (75M SSB 2-letter WAS #1657/#1789 -- both all mobile! ;^)  
- - - BoatAnchor Mailing List Owner - - -  
listown@jackatak.theporch.com-"Plus ca change, plus c'est la meme chose"

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: "Roberta J. Barmore" <rbarmore@indy.net>  
Subject: D-104s and grip-to-talk  
Message-ID: <Pine.3.89.9512080805.A450-0100000@indy2>

Hi, Gang!

Well, I was wrong: QST, Jan 1938, page 102:

"MICROPHONE CONTROL

"In the Palm of Your Hand

"As new as the new year...Astatic Grip-to-Talk Model CD-104 Microphone. Responds to instant operation of palm-control switch, cutting microphone in or out, at will. Designed especially for air-way ground stations, inter-office, inter-factory, amateur and other high class communicating systems. The is the famous D-104 microphone mounted on chrome desk standard

with telephone black base. Full year guarantee.  
"List Price \$27.50"

Above the text is a very clear photo of the exact grip-to-talk stand and mic assembly we all know. So it *\*wasn't\** postwar--and seems to be yet another innovation prompted by the needs of the fledgling air-traffic control ("Airways," back then) system, just as the AGS and HRO receivers were.

...We owe Airways quite a lot, I think!

73,  
--Bobbi

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: thaake@bsm2ee1.attmail.com (thaake)  
Subject: RE:D104Mics  
Message-ID: <PMX-TERM-2.02-bsm2ee1-thaake-5>

The recent thread on D104's and various comments as to what type of mics sound good on AM rigs brings a question to mind.

Regarding the electret type, what has been the members experiences? I have picked up over time a couple of decent Astatic stands and mics for almost nothing so I wasn't surprised to find they had dead elements. The *\*right\** thing to do is to replace the elements in the D104 shells but what to do with several other versions of Shure, Ev, and Astatic shells? The first thing that comes to mind is to put an electret inside. I've done this a dozen times with military headsets that I converted for use in general aviation AM comm radios and I think they have great audio sound but I have not tried them on the HF bands yet.

Any comments with there use and sound quality on the various boatanchor rigs?

Tim  
thaake@bsm2ee1.attmail.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: SOUNDNMIND@aol.com  
Subject: FS/Trade Scott Rx for audio  
Message-ID: <951207183124\_127717013@emout05.mail.aol.com>

Hi BA ites

For Sale or trade Scott RCH/CZC46209 navy rx, 50kc thru 24mc (no BC band) clean restorable condition. Ft panel black wrinkle finish. this unit does work. Chassis is clean, no rust or corrosion. Am asking \$140. + some help on shipping. OR...will trade for firebottle stereo or pair of mono amps. such as Dynaco ST-70 (chrome), Heath W5M's, W6M's, or Altec stuff. Altec mixers or compressors, etc.

Lets talk!

Dee, W4PNT  
(540) 949-8300 voice mail  
(540) 249-3161 late nites  
E-mail

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: SOUNDNMIND@aol.com  
Subject: FS/Ttrade BC779B for audio eq.  
Message-ID: <951207183122\_127716975@mail06.mail.aol.com>

Greetings BA'its

I have a very nice "Superpro" BC779B for sale or trade. Freq range 100kc thru 20mc (excludes BC band). Front panel is refinished original. Completely aligned. Performs very well and chassis is clean.  
The power supply is rack mount (black panel from spray can. I didnt refinish this panel), Is clean. Power & standby + indicators mounted on power supply panel. Rack mount Rx no cabinet.  
Am asking \$250 + help in shipping. OR....I will do some trading for Dynaco ST70 (chrome) factory stereo amp or Heath W5m's, W6m's etc etc w/ firebottles. Or...Altec stuff.....

Talk to me!

Regards.....

Dee, W4PNT  
(540) 949-8300 voice mail  
(540) 249-3161 late nites  
Or E-mail

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: "ROBERT W DOWNS, WA5CAB" <103012.2130@compuserve.com>  
Subject: FT-138 CONNECTOR CABLE CLAMPS  
Message-ID: <951208060728\_103012.2130\_GHU77-2@CompuServe.COM>

Group,

I'm looking for one or many of Cable Clamp FT-138. Looks somewhat like a common AN-3057 clamp - two #6-32 screws tightening a saddle bar onto the cable. Unpainted cast aluminum, with a six-tapped-hole flange for mounting to the back of the connector shell. Used on Signal Corps connectors PL-S59, PL-S61, etc., for BC-191 and some other ground sets. BC-375 used same connectors but different back-shell. No cable clamp. Also need some of a slightly smaller clamp which I don't have the number of which fits the PL-S74 4-pin connector for the same sets. Could be FT-137 or FT-139, but I don't know this for a fact. For further identification, the clamps are about the same size and shape as a standard 1/2" Romex clamp, except that the Romex clamp mounts with a nut.

73, Robert, WA5CAB  
103012.2130@compuserve.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: mburke@beast.sme.siemens.com (Michael Burke)  
Subject: info on the listserve for vintage radios & electronics  
Message-ID: <9512072348.AA20816@beast.sme.siemens.com>

from: Michael A. Burke	Seimens Medical Systems
Synetics Consultants	Electromedical Group
PO Box 439, 11 Scenic Dr	16 Electronics Avenue
Westminster, MA 01473	Danvers, MA 01923
508-874-0908	508-750-7500 x7147

Dear Gentlefolks,

Please send info on subscribing to the listserve for discussion of vintage radios and electronics. Thank you.

Michael A. Burke

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: "Greg Anders" <anders@autopsy.corp.sgi.com>  
Subject: Looking for Schematic  
Message-ID: <9512080854.ZM4398@autopsy.corp.sgi.com>

I recently adopted a Lafayette KT-200 general coverage receiver and would like to obtain a schematic. The radio is the late 50's/early 60s unit that looks a bit like a Halliscratchers S-38 with an S meter. If anyone can help I would appreciate it.

Thanks,

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: Michael.J.Knudsen@att.com  
Subject: Re: Looking for Schematic  
Message-ID: <9512081713.AA15774@bock.ih.att.com>

Sorry I don't have any info on this (except that Moore thinks it was Oriental). But here's a related question: Laffin-yet marketed a much fancier rx, with over a dozen tubes and dual conversion, that looks like an SX-62 or -101, vaguely. It could be a real good performer, or a dog. But should go cheap at swaps with that Lafeyette name on it.

Anybody ever see or use one? If I see one for \$50 should I talk him down to \$45 and grab it? Tnx es 73, mike k w9nrd

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: "Richard, Linda, James" <WB6ZWC@ns.net>  
Subject: Meter for 20-v3  
Message-ID: <199512081413.GAA15275@eagle.ns.net>

Tom K9TA:

Hold on to the meter I am definitely interested. I am installing a new scanner and hope to send you a (.bmp) or the likes for exact description.

Did you receive the private e-mail?

In the military we used to wide band the r-390's to about 60kcs. Had a stack of them, about 25, so we could cover a chunk of freq. Had to reset them every hour or so. We found them to be nightmares for maintenance. We did find the Russian subs tho.

Richard

\*\*\*\*\*  
Richard wb6zwc@ns.net  
James ke6kyp  
Linda ke6lit  
\*\*\*\*\*

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: USSAILIS@forum.phast.umass.edu  
Subject: More old sweepers  
Message-ID: <01HYJLIUMQ8Y7H41@oitvms.oit.umass.edu>

Anyone remember the Kay Electric sweeper that ysed two 723A/b (2k25) klystrons?  
One was fix tuned, the other swept. The two X-band outputs were mixed to provide a  
10.7 MHz out. Stable? HA

Jim, W1EQ0  
ussailis@forum.phast.umass.edu

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: "Tim Shoppa" <shoppa@krl.caltech.edu>  
Subject: No BC band on mil rcvrs?  
Message-ID: <9512080350.AA17614@altair.krl.caltech.edu>

I've always wondered why many of the military surplus receivers  
I see are missing the BC band - i.e. coverage from 540kHz  
to 1600kHz - when they often have excellent coverage below and  
above this range. Was some IF often put in this range? Or  
was it just to prevent people from listening to their favorite  
tunes while they were supposed to be working?

Tim KA0BTD

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: Michael.J.Knudsen@att.com  
Subject: Re: No BC band on mil rcvrs?  
Message-ID: <9512081627.AA15726@bock.ih.att.com>

Usually no IF in that range, at least not in WW II. Probably the  
main reason was to save money and complexity but leaving out one or  
two bands. A lot of mil sets used 2:1 or less frequency ratios  
per band, so omitting the 3:1 range of the BC band saved 2 bands.

Correct me if I'm wrong, but unlike amateur and some commercial and SW-BC  
services, standard AM BC was not curtailed during any wars, so the BC band  
was unusable for mil communications.

Therefore it would have had no use except BC listening.  
And as a bonus, as you say the ops wouldn't waste their time listening.  
There would usually be a "troop entertainment" rx around, to get the news  
and FDR's and Winnie's inspiring talks. 73, mike k w9nrd

PS: The RAX set of rx covers BC really well -- maybe Navy pilots wanted to be able

to DF the BC stations, or just stay awake on long flights.

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: Brien Pepperdine <pepperb@gov.on.ca>  
Subject: Paint for R390A front panel?  
Message-ID: <Pine.OSF.3.90.951207231755.22627C-100000@govonca2.gov.on.ca>

I have been asked to see if the BA list members can help me source out a good source of paint to be used to repaint the front panel of a R-390A.

As you will no doubt know, it is a Collins gray type paint - I myself don't know if the standard on was St. James gray or something lighter/darker. There is no known St. James stuff around to compare it to.

Anyhow, any suggestions for a good paint source / manufacturer etc. could be most welcome. We hope in particular that there is some Hammerlite, Krylon or some such relatively obtainable spray bomb we can get even here in the Metro Toronto area. We will go to the trouble of getting a liquid can full and getting a spray compressor etc. if necessary, but mail ordering paint from a non-local source--- - oh I hope the lids on tight!  
Excuse me if this has been answered before, but I had not been asked the question previously, so was not paying close attention.

73

Brien  
Toronto

pepperb@gov.on.ca

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: GDentHouTX@aol.com  
Subject: Question: re-forming caps?  
Message-ID: <951207144711\_127530235@emout04.mail.aol.com>

Hi ya'll:

May the spirit of A.A. Collins forgive me, but...I bought a ricebox. At least it is a boatanchor ricebox, a FTDX400. Given that this uses sweeps (6kd6's) in the final, what is the prevailing wisdom on bringing up the initial voltage slowly with a variac. I have pulled the tubes for testing and was going to re-install prior to powering up (slowly) the rig; but a school of thought suggests that bringing up filament voltage slowly is a good way to ruin sweep (or other?) tubes. Should I attempt to re-form the caps without

the tubes installed? Would this not place an unnatural load on the PS (esp w/o VR 105 in place)? Or should I re-install the tubes, power on at 6.3V (so the filaments are lit) and then bring up slowly from that point? What is the generally accepted procedure for this? (Oh no, I just realized while writing this, what the date is!!!).

Thanks & 73, Gerald KC5RNX (ex-WA5TVM)  
GDentHouTX@aol.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: TOM.A.ADAMS@mail.admin.wisc.edu  
Subject: Re. no BC band on mil RX  
Message-ID: <FC7M3419.FC7M3430@mail.admin.wisc.edu>

to: boatanchors@theporch.com

I really hadn't thought about it before, but there ARE a significant number of military sets that don't cover the 535 - 1605 KHz AM broadcast band.

In the case of some of 'em, the IF is where the broadcast band should be; the BC-348 is a prime example of that type (IF = 915 KHz). Another example is the Hammarlund SP-600-VLF. This critter's 1st IF is a REAL strange one, right at 705 KHz.

In others, it appears to have been a conscious design decision, based on what frequency range was most expendable to make room for specialized ranges. In the SP-600 sets, the frequency coverage of the basic version was 540 KHz to 54 MHz. In the SP-600-JL version, long wave coverage was desired. The basic radio would do it quite adequately with minimal changes; add new coil sets to the turrets, and use an appropriately calibrated main tuning dial. Two spaces on the standard coil turret were needed for sets covering 100 - 200 KHz and 200 - 400 KHz. It appears that the ranges of 540 - 1450 KHz and 30.0 - 54.0 MHz were deemed to be the least useful, and were sacrificed for the low frequency coils. I think the same sort of logic was applied in the SP-400 sets from WW2. The tactic just expands the flexibility of the previously developed design.

In small, portable field sets, the AM broadcast band was often eliminated to save the small additional weight, and additional circuitry complication (ie, lowered dependability caused by more parts to potentially go bad) which went with the addition of another band of frequencies. Also, bear in mind that the developers / manufacturers of military radios are like any other business in that they want maximum profits. Adding the AM broadcast band increases parts count on a radio, as well as labor costs for installation and adjustment of those parts during construction.

One other consideration rears it's ugly head here. In some nonmilitary



applications, specifically marine radio, inclusion of AM broadcast coverage may not be desirable. It used to be illegal for a marine operator to listen to broadcast radio while on duty. When not otherwise occupied s/he was expected to be on watch on the 500 KHz distress frequency.

73's,

Tom, K9TA

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: Jeffrey Herman <jherman@hawaii.edu>  
Subject: Re: Re. no BC band on mil RX  
Message-ID: <Pine.SV4.3.91.951207212559.10604D-100000@uhunix5>

> may not be desirable. It used to be illegal for a marine operator to listen to  
> broadcast radio while on duty. When not otherwise occupied s/he was expected  
> to be on watch on the 500 KHz distress frequency.  
> Tom, K9TA

<Gulp!> Now you tell me... While sitting the 500kc watch during the daylight hours, one could easily drift off into the ozone due to absolutely no tfc (daytime propagation on 500 provides at most 200mi reception). Thus, with two Collins 651-S rcvrs piped into the headphones (one rcvr for each ear) the daytime op might have a ballgame or the news or music coming through one of the 651's. Don't tell the ITU (nor the Chief!), though. (I wonder who that op was?)

Jeff NH6IL (ex NMO CW op)

P.S. So where did all those ships hang out during daylight hours?  
On the 8, 12, 16, and 22 Mc maritime CW bands.

P.P.S. So that no one thinks I was a rotten 500kc op for listening to the BC band, the 500kc volume was *\*always\** cranked up higher in the one ear than the ballgame was in the other.

P.P.P.S. The Chief couldn't scold us, for he had 20m tuned in on his console's 651-S. (If the Coast Guard does it then it's *\*not\** illegal!)

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: MODSTEPH@ACS.EKU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Re. no BC band on mil RX  
Message-ID: <01HYKAHC8XI6004V1N@ACS.EKU.EDU>

..and while we may have had other things on to listen to in the

maritime service, (like the 2182 kHz AM calling and safety frequency, and the FM 160 MHz thereabouts ditto), 500 Kcs was always not only there, but required to observe a silent period at :15 and :45 past the hour, for one minute, when no signals were allowed on 500 kHz except distress, and the silent period had to be logged each time (we developed the acronym "SPONSH" -- Silent Period Observed, No Signals Heard)...

73, Al N5AIT  
modsteph@acs.eku.edu

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: k1oik@ccsnet.com  
Subject: S-100 Hammurlund speaker  
Message-ID: <TCPSMTP.15.12.8.6.4.12.2644608140.2771342@ccsnet.com>

I had offers of \$40 for this speaker (9" x 9") but nothing more ever came of it.

If no one wants it for that price or thereabouts my students at school would like to paint it florescent orange and hook it up to the TS-140 there.

```
#####  
| Burt Fisher | Teacher of video, broadcasting and electronics |  
| Amateur call | South Dennis, Ma. (Cape Cod) |  
| K10IK | If you sit on the fence, it is a pain in the butt |  
#####  
| k1oik@ccsnet.com | MAC is 5% of the market |  
#####
```

Get a GIF of K10IK by telnet://ccsnet.com and go to FREE downloads for bflpres.gif (hams never had such excitement!) or call 508-385-3427 and download from file area 21 (free).

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: jschwart@ix.netcom.com (John Schwartzberg)  
Subject: Shure Mic Impedance  
Message-ID: <199512081547.HAA12939@ix5.ix.netcom.com>

Hey Gang -

Would anyone happen to know, or have documentation showing, the impedance of a Shure 414B hand mic?

TIA,

John  
N0GII

jschwart@ix.netcom.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: David Speegle <dspeegle@dialin.ind.net>  
Subject: Re: SP-600!  
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.951208054119.4382D-100000@dialin.ind.net>

Jake: Thanks for your help. I appreciate you taking the time to answer my request. Mine is a SP-600. Im not sure if it is JX or just plain SP-600. Thanks again! Dave NE9F

```
=====
| David Speegle          Email Alias: David.Speegle@dialin.ind.net
|
|
| 311 S West St.
|
| Argos, IN 46511
| Phone: 219.546.3848 FAX:
=====
```

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: "Ray L. Mote" <rmote@rain.org>  
Subject: Splined Wrenches for Setscrews  
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.951207233636.21776A-100000@coyote.rain.org>

My apologies to Jack, and to those who don't care about this. There have been enough inquiries in the past, I think, to justify a full listing of the measurements and part numbers/sources. I'd have been able to make it much shorter if the socket sizes exactly matched (slightly greater than) the available wrenches. I know it's a bandwidth problem, but believe it's needed. Please save to file and email future inquirers direct with the answers.

File: HEXSPLIN.ASC

7 December 1995

# SPLINED WRENCHES FOR SETSCREWS

SCREW SIZE	SET SCREW DIA.	HEX SOCKET SIZE	SPLINE SOCKET SIZE	SPLINE WRENCH SIZE	McMaster- Carr PART#
0	0.0600	0.028	0.035	.033	7048A11
1	0.0730	0.035	0.035	.033	11
2	0.0860	0.035	0.050	.048	12
3	0.0990	0.050	0.050	.048	12
4	0.1120	0.050	0.062	.060	14
-----				.069	15
5	0.1250	1/16	0.074	.072	17
6	0.1380	1/16	0.074	.072	17
-----				.076	16
8	0.1640	5/64	0.098	.096	18
10	0.1900	3/32	0.115	.111	19
-----				.133	21
1/4"	0.2500	1/8	0.149	.145	22
-----				.168	23
5/16"	0.3125	5/32	0.188	.183	24
3/8"	0.3750	3/16	0.221	.216	25
7/16"	0.4375	7/32	0.256	.251	41
1/2"	0.5000	1/4	0.298	.291	42

First four columns from MACHINERY'S HANDBOOK, 17TH EDITION, fifth printing, by Erik Oberg and F.D. Jones, Industrial Press, Inc., NY NY, 1966.

SCREW SIZE: Numbered screw size through #10; inches above that value.

SET SCREW DIA.: Screw diameter in inches

HEX SOCKET SIZE: Measured across flats, in inches

SPLINE SOCKET SIZE: Measured across splines, in inches

Last two columns from McMaster-Carr Supply Company catalog number 98. (310) 692-5911.

SPLINE WRENCH SIZE: Measured across splines, in inches

McMaster-Carr Part#: Their catalog number. All part numbers for splined wrenches begin with "7048A"

McMaster-Carr Recommended Sizes:

SPLINE

WRENCH SIZE	SCREW SIZE
0.033	0,1
0.048	2,3
0.060	4
0.069	5
0.072	5,6
0.076	6
0.096	8
0.111	10
0.145	1/4"
0.183	5/16"
0.216	3/8"
0.251	7/16"
0.291	1/2"

Notes:

1. Costs range from 48 cents to three dollars each (prices have almost certainly gone up some since then, but probably not a great deal.
2. The catalog shows .069 as an alternate for the #5 screw and .076 as an alternate for the #6. No recommendations are given for the .133 and .168. (The recommendation table shows other types of screws, with differing wrench sizes needed for each.) The first two alternates may be based on sizing of screws based on earlier (like maybe WW2?) standards. Screw sizes were not standardized until after WW2, and were then designated as "Unified" thread standards at the U.S., British, and Canadian standardization meetings. Personally, I took no chances, and bought 'em all!
3. I gave the hex socket size in the above table because it was readily available, and may be useful to you in selection of hex ("Allen") wrenches.
4. MACHINERY'S HANDBOOK appears to be an extremely handy (but expensive at \$65 for the current edition) volume. It has all sorts of data on screws, nails, rivets, etc., tools, metals and their characteristics, and so on. I got my used book for \$10, and if you watch the swapmeets and/or second-hand book sales, you can do something similar. Good hunting!

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: kf3p@cais.cais.com (Tyler Stewart)  
Subject: Squires-Sanders SS-R1  
Message-ID: <199512080150.UAA20824@cais.cais.com>

A friend of mine is looking for a manual or schematics on this piece of equipment.

If you can help, please send me email and I'll relay the info to him.

Thanks es 73, Tyler KF3P@cais.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: Bill Sorsby <bill.sorsby@dlep1.itg.ti.com>  
Subject: Super-Pro Advice Needed  
Message-ID: <199512080436.WAA29305@dlep1.itg.ti.com>

Greetings,

I finally got around to firing up the BC-779A I latched onto a couple of months ago. All I had to do was locate a power supply (thanks Robert), attach connectors to an existing power cable, and check the capacitors.

To my delight, everything about this receiver seems to work, although it obviously could use a tune-up and the front panel is missing lots of paint. Judging from the excellent interior condition of the receiver, this thing has led a sheltered life. It also appears that no parts have been replaced in this thing since it was manufactured. That seems quite a tribute to Hammarlund engineering, since the thing was made more than fifty years ago, in the early '40's. (Yes, it has the date on it somewhere.)

My question to you Hammarlund guys is this: Is there a known time bomb in here that I'm overlooking? I see one electrolytic in the audio output cathode circuit where it can't do much damage if it fails. There are a few 0.25 and .05 uf caps which look like big electrolytics but are non-polarized and are also in the audio section. I suppose these are really paper. They probably could do some damage if they fail. Do they have a tendency to fail?

BTW, it sure was fun to listen to this thing last night. It took me back a few years to the receiver I used in my novice days and for five or six years afterwards. Yes, that was a BC-779 too, albeit a -B model.

Any recommendations guys?

Regards,  
Bill Sorsby, N5BU                      bill.sorsby@dlep1.itg.ti.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: "Nickels, Bob" <RNickels@P16.IL50.micro.honeywell.com>  
Subject: Super-Pro Advice Needed  
Message-ID: <30C870DA@mail\_gw.micro.honeywell.com>

> Is there a known time bomb in here that I'm overlooking?

I rebuilt an SP-200 (commercial BC-779) a month ago, and ended up replacing virtually all of the caps except the bathtubs. After finding a few the hard way (smoke detection) I pulled one end of several others (micas) and all failed for leakage with anything over 50-100 volts applied, even though they looked perfect. My suggestion: replace 'em! The difference in performance was astounding...

73, Bob KE0T

-----

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: markem@primenet.com (Mark Monninger)  
Subject: T-X4B Tune-up  
Message-ID: <199512080330.UAA20370@usr4.primenet.com>

Thanks for the advice concerning my Drake T-4XB and the D-104. Doing a tune-up of it really helped. Before, I had to crank the gain full up to get decent modulation. After an hour or so of tweaking, following the manual, about 12:00 or a bit more gives plenty of modulation. Just a small tweak of the caps, etc made quite a difference. Those Drake circuits are certainly sharp. Actually, it was kinda fun to fiddle with. I hadn't messed with a glow-in-the-dark radio like that for quite a while.

Anyway, thanks to those who advised the tune-up...

73... Mark AA7TA

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: Terry Burge <terrybu@netman.ENS.TEK.COM>  
Subject: Re: T-X4B Tune-up  
Message-ID: <9512081613.AA11603@netman.ENS.TEK.COM>

I remember when I first got my license. My first rig was a Drake

TR-4. I decided that it wasn't hot enough so I got in and started tweeking it. Everything went fine till I messed with the balanced modulator as I recall it was labled. I ended up sending it back to Drake for alignment. I haven't tried messing with balanced modulator since.

Terry  
KI7M

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: "ROBERT W DOWNS, WA5CAB" <103012.2130@compuserve.com>  
Subject: TECH MANUALS OR NUMBERS WANTED  
Message-ID: <951208044611\_103012.2130\_GHU147-1@CompuServe.COM>

Group,

I've had two requests for TM's or info on TM's in the last month that I've drawn absolute blanks on. Does anyone have manuals or the manual numbers or even which branch of the US Military used the sets on the following?

TS-1294/U TRANSISTOR TESTER  
TS-1294A/U TRANSISTOR TESTER  
SG-1041/URM-191 SIGNAL GENERATOR  
AN/URM-191 (UNKNOWN)

I've gone through DA PAM 310-4 and DA PAM 25-30 from 1966 through 1991 and found nothing.

Thanks, Robert, WA5CAB  
103012.2130@compuserve.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: w7ni@teleport.com (Stan Griffiths)  
Subject: RE: UPS Rates  
Message-ID: <199512081121.DAA13847@desiree.teleport.com>

> Things must be different around the country. UPS just leaves packages  
> near the side door.  
>  
> 73 de Dennis, KG9DO doonan@cordmc.dnet.etn.com

Actually, they usually do that here too. I wonder if they would do it if you had a parcel that was heavily insured? Maybe their increased costs for residential delivery are due to paying off "theft from porch" claims?



Stan W7NI@teleport.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: Grant Youngman <gyoungma@gtetel.com>  
Subject: RE: UPS Rates  
Message-ID: <Chameleon.951208055003.gyoungma@gyoungma.gtetel.com>

>Maybe their increased costs for  
>residential delivery are due to paying off "theft from porch" claims?  
>

UPS normally leaves packages at the door if no one is home (at least they do here). It has never mattered how heavy (or badly damaged) the package was. A sender can request the packaged be classed as "signature required". In that case, they won't leave it unless someone signs for it. Which is good -- unless you don't have anyone at home during the day -- in which case you have to wait for them to attempt delivery on THREE consecutive days, and THEN go to a central facility to pick it up.

If you're concerned about theft, have the shipper send it "Will Call". UPS will notify you when they have the package ready, and you just go to the central facility and pick it up. (Of course those locations always seem to be clear across town from wherever you are ... )

Grant

-----  
Grant Youngman -- NQ5T  
gyoungma@gtetel.com  
-----

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: Brien Pepperdine <pepperb@gov.on.ca>  
Subject: Viking II CC ??  
Message-ID: <Pine.OSF.3.90.951208093025.6273B-100000@govonca2.gov.on.ca>

I have been asked by a friend who knows I have a Viking II this question:  
what makes a Viking II CC a CC?

Eg. what's the CC designate?

Thanks

Brien  
Toronto

pepperb@gov.on.ca

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: buska@aaic.advantest.com (d.buska@advantest.com)  
Subject: Wanted - Ranger Cabinet  
Message-ID: <95120807493117@aaic.advantest.com>

Wanted:

Cabinet (only) for Johnson Ranger.  
Must not have any new holes added!

73  
Don N900  
d.buska@advantest.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: Scott\_Johnson-AZAX60@email.sps.mot.com  
Subject: WTB- BC-348 dynamotor, 18S-  
Message-ID: <"Macintosh \*/PRMD=MOT/ADMD=MOT/C=US/"@MHS>

WTB: BC-348 dynamotor, 18S-4 manual  
Looking for a dynamotor assy. for a BC-348. Also, does anyone out there have  
experience and/or a manual for a Collins 18S Airborne HF xcvr?  
73, Scott

From boatanchors@theporch.com Fri Dec 8 17:30:00 1995  
From: Michael.J.Knudsen@att.com  
Subject: Re: Yet more D-104 talk...  
Message-ID: <9512071717.AA15100@bock.ih.att.com>

Many thanks to Grant for his details on the D104 family.  
However, in my case, where I have too much bass, it seems I should try  
to \*lower\* the resistance/impedance that the element works into.

Maybe I can stick a little 2 Meg trimpot across the element leads into the preamp and vary the loading.

But first I'll check the head and see if it's the dynamic version.

If so, I need a smaller cap somewhere in the preamp.

73, mike k w9nrd